UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/569,229	02/23/2006	Hiroyuki Atake	Q93395	7824	
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 03/10/201 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER			
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			ABRAHAM, AMJAD A		
	SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1744		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/10/2011	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/569,229	ATAKE, HIROYUKI	
ſ	Examiner	Art Unit	
l	AMJAD ABRAHAM	1744	

Application No.

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this
application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).
7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Applicant argues that the space provided for in the Atake reference does not establish enough space for the clamping devices to pass through. More specifically, it seems that applicant is arguing that the clamping devices must only pass through the space
defined between the connecting member and said parting surface. However, applicant has not claimed this feature. In response
to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon
which applicant relies (i.e., [passing clamping devices ONLY in the space between connecting member and parting surface]) are
not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the
specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).Applicant has claimed the claims in terms of open-ended language which leads to the possibility that additional space can be provided at some
other part of the assembly to allow the clamping devices to pass through in conjunction with the space between the connecting
member and said parting surface. Applicant also argues that Yamazaki does not teach wherein the connencting member and the
parting surface has a space that the clamping member can fit, between because Yamazaki's disclosure says that the film
issealed to the parting surface by a clamper (30). Examiner submits that the action of the clamper is immaterial as examiner has supplied Yamazaki to teach another configuration for forming a space which can house a clamping device. As the primary
reference Atake already teaches a moveable clamping device this argument is not persuasive.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
13. Other:

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

/Yogendra N Gupta/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791 /AMJAD ABRAHAM/ Examiner, Art Unit 1744 Application No.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20110302